

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address CoMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, DOI: 1092-1 www.uspto.gov

			www dat to box	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09 806.324	03 29/2001	Outi Vaarala	227-139	6790
	590 04 03 2003			
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 1100 N GLEBE ROAD			EXAMINER	
8TH FLOOR ARLINGTON.	VA 22201-4714		WONG, LESLIE A	
,	22201 //14		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
			DATE MAILED: 04-03/2003	'i )

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/806,324

Vaarala et al.

## Office Action Summary

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit 1761

Applicant(s)



The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
i oriod for nepty					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>three</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.					
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.					
If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (20) days	hin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  oply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.				
Status					
1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Jan 2</u> ,	2003				
2a) X This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This	action is non-final.				
the produce dider Ex	ce except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Cialins					
4) X. Claim(s) <u>13-34</u>	is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
o). Claim(s)	is/are allowed.				
0/ X. Claim(s) 13-34	is/are rejected				
77. Claim(s)	is/are objected to				
O) · Cidiffis	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
•	and a second in requirement.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10). The drawing(s) filed on is/a	re a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) he held in the				
The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disapproved by the F				
m approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	y to this Office action.				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exar	niner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a/ ∴ All b) ∴ Some* c) ∴ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.					
3 Copies of the certified copies of the priority (	documents have been received in this National Stage				
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the Acknowledgement is made of a claim for the state of the state o	ne certified copies not received.				
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).				
a) The translation of the foreign language provision  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for demonstration.	al application has been received.				
15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic Attachment(s)	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1761

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Vaarala et al (WO 98/48640).

Vaarala et al teach a process for removing bovine insulin from a protein material using a resin treatment combined with a filtration treatment as is claimed (see entire document). It is notoriously well-known that the resin (Amberlite manufactured by Rohm & Haas) utilized in Example 1 (page 8) is a styrene based adsorption resin. Vaarala et al also teach the reduction of the bovine insulin content of the protein (see page 7, lines 4 to page 8, line 30).

The claims appear to differ as to the recitation of specific pore size.

The pore size is seen as no more than inherent and/or obvious to that of Vaarala et al because the same resins are used.

Application/Control Number: 09/806324

Art Unit: 1761

Page 3

Applicant's arguments filed January 2, 2003 have been fully considered in view of the new ground of rejection but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art requires additional steps.

It is noted that the claimed invention does not exclude additional steps.

In the absence of unexpected results, it is not seen how the claimed invention differs from the teachings of the prior art. Applicant's claims are drawn to a combination of known components which produces expected results, see In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 and In re Gershon 152 USPQ 602.

All of the claim limitations and arguments have been considered. None of them are seen as serving as basis for patentability.

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Application/Control Number: 09/806324 Page 4

Art Unit: 1761

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 308-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 for non-final responses and (703) 872-9311 for after-final responses.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Leslie Wong Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761

Listie WMG

LAW April 2, 2003